

Appl. No. 10/027,686
Amdt. Dated 10/13/2005
Reply to Final Office Action of August 23, 2005

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed August 23, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and request reconsideration of the allowability of claims 1-20. Independent claims 1, 7 and 13 have been revised.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shah (U.S. Patent No. 6,292,832) in view of Still (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,390). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

As the Examiner is aware, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *See MPEP §2143; see also In Re Fine, 873 F. 2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2D 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)*. Herein, the combined teachings of the cited references fail to describe or suggest all of the claim limitations.

For instance, as set forth in independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Shah nor Still, alone or in combination, teach or suggest the translation of a plurality of *relative links* into a corresponding plurality of *absolute links* that...point to the *local domains associated with at least two* of the plurality of personal content directors. *Emphasis added*. As claimed, the translation of the absolute links involves links directed to more than one local domain, which is supported by page 12 of the subject application.

Applicants agree that Shah does not teach that the data includes a plurality of relative links and the translating operation as claimed. *See pages 2-3 of the Office Action*. Column 4, lines 58-63 of Still describes a server proxy (210) that intercepts a HTML result, namely one or more HTML pages recovered from a resource (216) in communication with server (208), and

Appl. No. 10/027,686
Amdt. Dated 10/13/2005
Reply to Final Office Action of August 23, 2005

scans the HTML result to identify references (c.g., hyperlink) to resources hosted by the server (208). If any references are found, they are modified to refer to the server (206) or server proxy (210).

Hence, the combined teachings of Shah and Still are directed to a process where links are modified to absolute links associated with a single local domain, which is contrary to the claimed invention that alters relative links into absolute links pointing to multiple local domains. See page 12, lines 6-23 of the subject application. In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of both Shah and Still teaches away from the claimed invention in which the communications are focused to a centralized server (c.g., distributed director 506, server 206/210) and are not directed to modification of the relative links to absolute links involving at least two local domains as claimed. As defined in claim 1, the absolute link is a superset of the relative link by further including a domain name as set forth in an illustrative example on page 12 of the subject application.

With respect to independent claims 7 and 13, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Shah nor Still, alone or in combination, teach or suggest (1) the translation of a plurality of relative links into a corresponding *plurality of absolute links with a first absolute link pointing to a first local domain different from a local domain associated with the personal content director and a second absolute link pointing to a second local domain different from the local domain associated with the personal content director and the first local domain* (claim 7) or (2) a first *personal content director (PCD)* of the at least two PCDs that is adapted to translate the relative links associated with the web page into *corresponding absolute links that uniquely point to local domains associated with both of the at least two PCDS*. *Emphasis added.*

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection as applied to independent claims 1, 7 and 13.

Furthermore, based on the dependency of claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-20 on independent claims 1, 7 and 13, which are believed by Applicants to be in condition for allowance, no further discussion as to the grounds for traverse is warranted. Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in an Appeal is warranted. Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection as applied to claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-20 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/027,686
Amdt. Dated 10/13/2005
Reply to Final Office Action of August 23, 2005


Conclusion

In view of the remarks made above, it is respectfully submitted that pending claims 1-20 define the subject invention over the prior art of record. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: October 13, 2005

By 
William W. Schaal
Reg. No. 39,018
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.84)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:


MAILING

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 10/13/2005

FACSIMILE

☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and Trademark Office.


Susan McFarlane
Date 10/13/2005